

MASTER ISSUES LIST - TABLE OF CONTENTS

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date	Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Billing	1	Resolved		02/02/00	Remittance	31			01/27/00
Billing	2	Resolved		02/02/00	Policy	32			05/09/00
Billing	3	Resolved		02/02/00	Metering	33	Resolved		06/22/00
Billing	4	Resolved		02/02/00	Policy	34	Pending		01/27/00
Billing	5	Resolved		02/02/00	Metering	35	Pending		08/16/00
Billing	6	Resolved		02/02/00	Policy	36			01/27/00
Billing	7	Pending		06/22/00	Metering	37	Pending		04/27/00
Billing	8	Resolved		02/24/00	Policy	38			01/27/00
Billing	9	Resolved		02/24/00	Metering	39			04/27/00
Billing	10	Resolved		03/08/00	Metering	40	Resolved		05/18/00
Billing	11	Resolved		02/02/00	Metering	41			04/27/00
Billing	12	Resolved		02/02/00	Remittance	42			02/01/00
Billing	13	Resolved		02/02/00	Billing	43			02/02/00
Billing	14	Resolved		02/02/00	Policy	44	Resolved		05/23/00
Billing	15	Resolved		02/02/00	Metering	45	Resolved		05/18/00
Billing	16	Resolved		04/06/00	Policy	46	Resolved		04/25/00
Billing	17	Resolved		02/24/00	Policy	47			01/25/00
Billing	18			03/22/00	Policy	48	Resolved		02/29/00
Billing	19			04/06/00	DASR	49			01/25/00
Billing	20	Resolved		02/02/00	DASR	50			01/25/00
Billing	21			02/02/00	DASR	51			01/25/00
Billing	22	Resolved		03/08/00	Policy	52			01/25/00
Billing	23	Resolved		04/06/00	Metering	53			04/27/00
Billing	24			06/22/00	Metering	54	Pending		08/16/00
Metering	25			06/22/00	Policy	55			01/25/00
Policy	26			02/01/00	Policy	56			05/09/00
Policy	27	Resolved		02/29/00	Billing	57			04/06/00
Policy	28			02/01/00	Billing	58			06/22/00
Policy	29			02/08/00	Billing	59			02/08/00
Remittance	30			01/27/00	Billing	60			02/08/00

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Metering	61	07/20/00
Billing	62	04/06/00
Billing	63	02/08/00
Metering	64 Resolved	04/13/00
Metering	65 Resolved	07/20/00
Metering	66 Resolved	04/27/00
Metering	67	08/16/00
Metering	68 Resolved	02/17/00
Policy	69	02/17/00
Policy	70	02/22/00
Metering	71	04/27/00
Billing	72	05/24/00
Policy	73	06/22/00

Subcommittee	Issue #	Status	Page #	Revision Date
Policy	74 Pending	04/25/00
DASR	75	03/16/00
DASR	76	03/16/00
Policy	77 Resolved	06/22/00
Policy	78 Pending	07/20/00
Metering	79	06/22/00
Policy	80	06/22/00
Policy	81	06/22/00
Billing	82	07/20/00
Metering	83	07/20/00
Billing	84	07/19/00
Policy	85	07/20/00
Policy	86	07/20/00

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
01	Tax Exempt: Does the ESP currently get Tax Exempt status on 810? Is the ESP required to have certificates for existing exempt customers? (New West Energy)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	11/10/00 End-use customer responsibility to provide tax exemption status to each of their providers. 02/02/00 Bill Rigsby to bring tax statutes to Billing on 02/09/00 for clarification. May be included in recommendation. Resolution still stands.		Resv
02	Credit/Debit Amount by record (APS)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	Will be added to Implementation Guide as an optional code. 02/02/00 Resolution still stands.		Resv
03	Balance (BAL) vs. Total monetary value summary (TDS) for invoice payment. Issue for UDC, they cannot bill past due charges since they may not be aware of payment amounts and dates.	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	UDC will not send payment information to ESP because ESP is covering customer's receivable to UDC. 02/02/00 Resolution still stands. UDC will send current charges only for ESP consolidated billing. 02/08/00 Revisit when the Implementation Guide is written.		Resv
04	Invoice Start & End Date: Do we need to state on bill?	10/13/99	Billing		10/13/99 02/02/00	Rule Language (R14-2-1617) states "time period to which the reported information applies" 02/02/00 Proposed rule has changed. Consensus that both parties shall disclose this information (R14-2-210). Resolution stands.		Resv
05	Reason for Estimate - Do both parties need to give?	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	No, Billers responsibility to print this in bill using 867 standard estimation reason codes. See Business Rules. 02/02/00 Resolution stands.		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
06	Should non-utility charges be included on ESP consolidated bills? (New West Energy)	10/13/99	Billing		11/10/99	UDC cannot pass charges for non-utility related charges for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill. Example: home security, Internet services. 02/02/00 Resolution stands.		Resv
07	How will Rebate/Rebill be handled? (APSES/New West Energy) ESP	10/26/99	Billing			<p>Confirm this as a business decision. Will this be handled as cancel/rebill or adjustment line item. This can be translated to EDI rule. Issue can be raised in 12/03/99 PSWG Meeting.</p> <p>UIG recommends cancel/rebill scenario. Most UDCs can support the cancel/rebill scenario.</p> <p>MRSP must post corrected EDI 867s for retrieval by all parties. Three categories of Billing Adjs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Usage Related (dead meter, bad multiplier, etc.) Cancel/rebill 2. Rate related (incorrect rate calculation) Cancel/rebill 3. Non-usage related (flat rate, tax changes) Misc. Adjustment <p>02/02/00 Still an issue. Also, what happens if ESP or UDC discovers a need to backbill and customer has switched several times since original billing took place. (R14-2-210E) See Cancel/Rebill discussion document.</p> <p>03/08/00 <u>Action</u>: (APS) will bring a copy of an actual 810 showing a cancel/rebill and how it is represented in EDI format. (All UDCs) need to report on their cancel/rebill thresholds. (All participants) need to identify business issues in relation to rebate/rebill and misc. adjustments. (ESPs) will bring actual scenarios of their experiences in CA.</p>	1	Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>03/22/00 Discussion re: way of communicating specified re-bate/rebill information outside of the 810 for interim. <u>Action:</u> UDC's to discuss the interim proposal and be prepared to discuss outcome.</p> <p>04/06/00 UDC's still evaluating long term and short term process. <u>Action:</u> UDC's to complete review of items for rebill data. Determine short term process we can commit to.</p> <p>05/24/00 APS and TEP suggested changes to BEN and Re-bate/Rebill notifications. <u>Action:</u> (Janie Mollon) will incorporate and distribute implementation plan, implementation guide and samples for review by 06/06/00. Proposed notification processes will be presented at 06/22/00 Billing and PSWG meetings.</p> <p>06/22/00 Proposal approved by Billing subcommittee.</p>		
08	UDC Information - Does UDC have to pass contact information address, etc. on each transaction – including the ACC phone number?	10/26/00	Billing		02/24/00	<p>02/02/00 (Stacy Aguayo) contacted two ESPs. Their preference is to have static information, such as emergency numbers, etc. not passed each time on the 810 document every time a customer bills. More discussion by market participants is needed.</p> <p>02/08/00 (New West Energy) If UDCs continue to pass static data, they will null it in their system.</p> <p>Proposal: UDC will provide the UDC emergency contact number and ACC dispute phone number once. ESP will provide this information on each bill. UDC will advise ESP 30 days written notice in advance of any change to this information.</p> <p>02/24/00 UDCs will make available to PSWG a consolidated list</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>of UDC Emergency Contact Numbers. Responsibility of UDCs to communicate to subsequent ESPs the UDC Contact Number and ACC dispute number to ESP when ESP Service Agreement is executed.</p> <p>Long-term Solution: UDC will provide UDC emergency contact numbers and ACC number to ESP at time of certification with UDC.</p> <p>02/24/00 Proposal above was accepted.</p>		
09	Are tables graphs applicable this year/last year/last month?	10/26/00	Billing		02/24/00	<p>This data will not be passed on 810 to ESP for Consolidated Billing.</p> <p>02/02/00 Resolved pending rule investigation.</p> <p>02/08/00 No requirements found in Rules. UDC will not pass this information and ESP is not required to print this information on bill.</p> <p>02/24/00 Issue resolved. 810 will not have a place to pass last months/last years consumption for ESP to place in a table.</p>		Resv
10	Business, Regulatory Notices and advertising messages - How to handle? What would be size (# of lines) and content/placement on the bill? Example: disconnect notices, Levelized changes, capital	10/26/99	Billing		03/08/00	<p>Need to offer a bill message field on the guide to pass Regulatory or Business information. Advertisements would be handled through contractual agreements between ESP and UDC.</p> <p>02/02/00 <u>Action</u>: Utilities to research their company's bill message size, # of characters, # of bill messages used.</p> <p>02/08/00 <u>Action</u>: UDC to come back with type of bill messages they intend to send for ESP Consolidated billing. Shirley Renfroe</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	credits. How do we anticipate handling non-regulatory messages on the bill.					<p>will bring information from CA, CUBR, UIG.</p> <p>Proposal for broadcast message types: UDC will post ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory messages on their web site in a timely manner and notify ESP contact there is a new message to be printed on the customer's bill. ESP will retrieve new message verbiage from UDC's web site.</p> <p>Proposal for customer specific messages: UDC will pass ACC or Legislated mandatory/regulatory message with customer's bill data. This will transmit via normal billing process agreed upon between the UDC and ESP. ESP is required to print message on UDC portion of consolidated bill. Advertising and business messages will not be passed by UDC to ESP for printing on bill.</p>		
11	Will ESPs want to partake in SurePay? (Debit ESPs Bank Account for monies owed to the UDC)	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	<p>Contractual agreement between ESP and UDC.</p> <p>02/02/00 Resolution applies.</p>		Resv
12	3 rd party Billing - (Should UDC continue to offer?)	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	<p>Arrangement will need to be made between Biller (in this case the ESP) and their customer.</p> <p>02/02/00 Resolution applies.</p>		Resv
13	Payment Date appearing on customer's bill.	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	<p>Payment date, payment amount and payment received date will not be passed to the ESP on 810 for printing on an ESP Consolidated Bill.</p> <p>02/02/00 Resolution applies. Since UDC does not know when or if a payment is actually received from the customer in ESP Consolidated Billing, this information will not be passed.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
14	Transmission Charge - Should it be displayed on the bill?	10/26/99	Billing		11/10/99	<p>This will be settled with the Scheduling Coordinator.</p> <p>02/02/00 Any transmission charge identified as an end-use customer charge will be included in UDC portion of bill. All other charges will be settled with Scheduling Coordinator. Example: Fixed must run charges are identified as an end use customer bill. Resolution stands.</p>		Resv
15	Does standardization need to allow for Summary Billing - ESP Consolidated Billing?	11/10/99	Billing		02/02/00	<p>UDC would need to pass service periods. Would UDC unsummarize customer's bill for ESP Consolidated Billing?</p> <p>(New West Energy) Biller of end use customer is entity that should summarize the bill. (TEP) not supporting summary billing for Direct Access customers due to cash flow issues. In their proposed tariff (Article 24), but they have not been approved.</p> <p>02/02/00 (APSES) Biller of end use customer should summarize the bill. (SSVEC - Barry Scott) -- Entity doing billing should provide consolidation. Customers will resist having bills coming from all over the place. In some respects, this would be a step back to go from one bill for electrical service to many.</p>		Resv
16	Will ESPs be required to remit charitable contributions (SHARE/Hero)?	11/10/99	Billing		<p>04/06/00</p> <p>see Issue 43</p>	<p>Discuss 12/03/99 at PSWG meeting.</p> <p>(New West Energy) Does not want to be responsible for tracking and remitting funds back to UDC for distribution to the charitable organizations.</p> <p>02/02/00 (APSES) agrees with New West Energy's position. ESP is liable for remitting the pledge amounts to UDC potentially before customer actually pays ESP.</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>(SSVEC - Barry Scott) - Entity producing bill should be responsible for collecting entire payment. They should disburse money accordingly. It will become a quagmire if each competitive entity only feels a responsibility to collect their piece of the pie. (How will we ever handle delinquents and partial payments?) This does not even consider resentment customers will feel about having to send checks to all of these diverse places to make sure their electrical bill is paid. This reasoning should apply to charitable programs as well, for example "Operation Roundup".</p> <p>02/08/00 Who is responsible for paper-work if customer wants to remit charitable contributions</p> <p>03/22/00 <u>Action:</u> UDC's determine what their position is, why they do SHARE program, implications if they don't , and a proposal of how to handle this issue.</p> <p>04/06/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) Nothing in rules requiring UDC's or ESP's to remit charitable contributions. (TEP) will only offer charitable contributions for Dual Billing. They will not offer it with ESP Consolidated. Currently undecided on UDC Consolidated billing. (APS) will continue to offer it on all billing options and will maintain the "paperwork". (Trico) thinks they would offer it, but need to evaluate this further. (New West Energy) flexible as long as they don't have to deal with the "paper work".</p> <p>Resolution: There are no regulatory requirements for ESPs to remit payments. An agreed upon arrangement between ESP and UDC would need to be in place to offer any charitable contributions.</p>		
17	Will ESPs support levelized	12/01/99	Billing		02/24/00	Could be a hindrance for a customer to go Direct Access (in the		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	UDC billing line items?					<p>case of a large debit balance). ESPs would not want this large debit balance passed to them for payment. More input from ESPs and UDCs needed.</p> <p>02/02/00 (APS) plans to offer this option if they are Billing entity. (TEP) is not planning to offer this billing option for DA Customers. (SSVEC - Barry Scott) Any customer desiring to go to competitive access should settle all of their accounts with UDC first. If we will handle the process as we currently do for a customer going from one UDC to another we will be better off.</p> <p>02/08/00 (SRP) will offer Levelized to customers for UDC Consolidated and Dual billing for distribution charges only. (APS) doesn't offer Levelized for ESP Consolidated. (TEP) doesn't offer levelized billing for DA customer regardless of billing option.</p> <p>Proposal: ESP has option to offer levelized billing to end use customer. UDC will not pass levelized billing line items for ESP Consolidated billing.</p> <p>02/24/00 Above proposal accepted.</p>		
18	<p>For end use customer billing (dual billing situation), ACC Rules are not specific about what the utility and ESPs are obligated to show on their bills.</p> <p>ESP</p>	02/02/00	Billing			<p>02/02/00 In many markets (CA specifically) begin and end meter reads need not be displayed on a bill. In Arizona market, utilities are required to show specific pieces of information but it's unclear if ESPs are required to follow same rules. This could apply to all revenue cycle services.</p> <p>02/24/00 (ACC - Bill Rigsby) reported on ACC Rules, refer to sections R14-2-210B-2 and R14-2-1612. Verbiage states that ALL bills must contain the data elements referred to in these sections. UDCs would be required to show a generation line item on their</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>bill (dual billing) showing a zero amount due. Additionally, ESP would be required to show a CTC charge on their portion of the bill with a zero amount due.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs/UDCs create a proposal for short term solution which may require filing for waiver to the Rules as a short term solution. All parties to come up with possible long-term changes to the Rules.</p> <p>Issue for MRSPs: Begin and end reads must be printed on bill according to the Rules. So, these must be passed to the billing parties.</p> <p>03/08/00 Should a Rule change be suggested as a short-term solution. It is possible to put this in a combined waiver of issues that need to be changed in the Rules. A long term solution would be actually to change the verbiage.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs and UDCs should come prepared with their company's position in regards to filing waivers. Group will come up with proposal about how this issue should be resolved.</p> <p>03/14/00 Decision to have a separate waiver filed for this issue (separate from #28,36, & 56).</p> <p>03/22/00 Proposal: Bill party needs to itemize the bill components to allow customer to break down/re-calculate the bill.</p>		
19	Once troubleshooting process has taken place, and UDC is estimating (an MRSP did not deliver data in	02/02/00	Billing			<p>Need to specify under what conditions the UDC could estimate a bill and pass this information to the ESP.</p> <p>02/24/00 (APS - Shirley Renfroe) reported the EDI 810 allows for</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	a timely manner or the read could not be retrieved), should UDC transmit estimation reasons for ESP Consolidated Bill.					<p>an estimation reason code to be passed to ESP.</p> <p>Proposal: If MRSP fails to provide a meter read and the exception processing window has passed, UDC may estimate and provide an indicator why bill was estimated. ESP is required to print this reason on UDC portion of the bill pursuant to Rule 14-2-210-6B.</p> <p>03/08/00 Reason codes need to be developed before this can be resolved.</p> <p>04/06/00 Resolution: Use a reason code of: Meter Data not available</p>		
20	Can other utility service charges be passed to ESP for Consolidated Billing (gas, water, sewer, telephone, etc.)	02/02/00	Billing		02/02/00	02/02/00 May not be in scope of the PSWG charge. We are focusing on transfer of electric information only. May need to be addressed at a later date.		Resv
21	DA Market Issue – for UDC or Dual billing options, will Summary Billing be available for DA customers? UDC/Dual	02/02/00	Billing			02/02/00 (TEP) will not offer Summary Billing per pending Article 24. (APS) feels it is a billers service. If APS is the biller they will offer these services. (SRP) will offer these services for Dual or UDC Consolidated Billing.	3	Open
22	If customer has a credit or debit balance when they switch to DA, is the utility obligated to refund that money?	02/02/00	Billing		03/08/00	<p>02/08/00 Levelized / Equalizer was briefly discussed regarding debit or credit balances.</p> <p>02/24/00 APS will final out standard offer account and bill customer separately if there is a debit. If customer does not pay and</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>is eligible for disconnect, they notify ESP. If there is a credit they will refund this to customer prior to the switch for DA.</p> <p>Proposal: When customer goes DA and they have a credit balance, with the exception of Capital credits, UDC will apply it to any outstanding receivable owing. UDC will then refund remaining credit directly to customer in accordance to their applicable Rules and Regulations. When customer goes DA and they have a debit balance, it will be the sole responsibility of UDC to collect money from customer.</p>		
23	If utility is holding a customer deposit and customer switches to ESP consolidated billing, is the utility required to refund entire deposit since receivable is paid to UDC by ESP?	02/02/00	Billing		04/06/00	<p>(APS - Stacy Aguayo) went over flow chart for Deposit Process for ESP Consolidated billing and Deposit Process for UDC consolidated billing (see attachment to 02/24/00 Billing minutes)</p> <p>03/08/00 There is no formal Rule requirement dictating deposit refunds for ESP Consolidated billing customers. Current business processes have been identified (see flow) for TEP, SRP and APS. Other UDCs can submit their deposit business processes to the Billing Subcommittee Chairperson. Deposit requirements are to be determined by the individual companies based on their individual credit policies. No further action needed.</p>		Resv
24	When UDC estimates the bill in ESP Consolidated billing, an agreed upon process and timeframe needs to be set for troubleshooting before bill is actually sent to customer. (Marilyn Ferrara) ESP/UDC/Dual	02/02/00	Billing			<p>02/02/00 This is a meter reading to data input billing issue. Examples include the CA model – MADEN Meter and Data Exception Notice. Could be impacted by VEE rule differences, etc.</p> <p>02/24/00 (New West Energy - Janie Mollon) is preparing a suggested model for Arizona to report billing and metering exceptions. Janie will send out proposal and suggestions. <u>Action</u>: Review and send comments to Janie (recommendation, timeline, with your proposed modification.) Janie will compile for next</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>meeting.</p> <p>03/08/00 Billing Subcommittee agreed that an exception process such as the MADEN is needed for handling exceptions. MADEN process will be submitted to Policy Subcommittee for standardization across all subcommittee exception process. All committee members should review document in its entirety and be prepared to discuss implementation issues. (APS - Stacy Aguayo) will check with CA UDCs to see if more MADEN information is available.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> UDCs need to re-evaluate the time frame of estimation. Is there any flexibility before estimating? What notifications should/are in place for notifying MRSPs of missing data?</p> <p>03/22/00 Take BEN proposal to our companies and discuss possibility of implementing this notification process. Be prepared to talk about possible implementation guidelines.</p> <p>04/06/00 <u>Action:</u> UDC's need to determine how many days after read due date will ESP/MRSP be notified of missing data and how many days does MSP have to get data after notification before UDC estimates? <u>Action:</u> If MRSP estimates their reads and the estimates cause an exception to produce, can UDC estimate on an estimate? <u>Action:</u> UDC's check "tolerance" level of their VEE rules.</p> <p>05/24/00 Estimation process for APS and TEP are outlined in BEN (Billing Exception Notice – see ACC report). VEE tolerance levels to be discussed in newly formed VEE Subcommittee.</p> <p>06/22/00 Some changes were recommended to BEN process.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
25	What specific VEE rules should utilities use on an ongoing basis to verify and bill off of incoming MRSP reads. (PSWG – Billing)	01/26/00	Metering			<p>01/26/00 Since MRSPs use different algorithms, it's difficult for utilities to determine if MRSPs are performing VEE on an ongoing basis. If utilities use their own VEE systems to verify reads it may cause invalid rejections.</p> <p>02/01/00 What is the utilities responsibility to audit MRSPs? Rules state this certification must take place yearly.</p> <p>04/27/00 A sub/subgroup was formed to review existing VEE rules, develop objectives, changes and proposals (if needed), develop performance measures and monitoring criteria. TEP - Tony Gilloly, APSES, New West Energy - Janie Mollon, C3 Comm, CSC, APS, SRP - Greg Carrel, a representative from the Co-ops (possibly Barry Scott), and possibly First Point. Renee Castillo volunteered to chair this sub/subgroup and will set up a meeting with these participants.</p> <p>06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering subcommittee</p>		Open
26	XML versus EDI – What is XML? Should this be considered for a best practice for the Arizona's model? (ACC Staff – Deb Scott and Jerry Smith)	01/25/00	Policy			<p>Issue for Policy subcommittee to investigate. This is not a transport mechanism, it is defined as a data structure.</p> <p>02/01/00 – Ray Wenzel - Excelergy, offered to coordinate a presentation to PSWG on XML. Evelyn Dryer will address with ACC and possibly get this on a large group agenda.</p>	3	Open
27	Companies are defining 'workdays' for time frames for work to be completed. Some companies are in-	01/26/00	Policy		02/29/00	In some territories Columbus Day, MLK Day are recognized as holidays and are excluded from a workday calculation. This could affect time periods defined for metering, meter reading, Consolidated billing and enrollment.		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	<p>cluding holidays that are not recognized by others. Need to define 'standardized workday'. (PSWG – Billing)</p> <p>Suggestion: NERC holidays recognized but modified. If a NERC holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday and if the holiday falls on a Sunday it is recognized on a Monday.</p> <p>Standardized Work Days: Any day except Saturday/ Sunday or NERC holiday. If holiday falls on a Saturday it is recognized on a Friday. If the holiday falls on a Sunday, it is recognized on a Monday.</p>					<p>02/01/00 – Standardization of holidays may not be possible. (Suggestion 1) If Federal or State Holidays are defined, these could be used as an exception to workdays for ALL participants. (Suggestion 2) Use NERC definition of holiday. Evelyn Dryer to provide to the Policy Group.</p> <p><u>Action due 02/15/00:</u> All participants need to take these suggestions to their organizations to see what will work. Items to consider: Cash flow, bill cycles, read cycles, settlement etc. Also, bring a list of your organizations recognized holidays. Be prepared to discuss impact to company's if we recommend NERC holidays only, OR if we were to recognize all State and Federal Holidays. (Darrell Pichoff) to bring list of Postal/ Federal Holidays. (Steve Olea) to bring list of State Holidays.</p> <p>02/16/00 – Pending Resolution (see UDC holiday matrix – enclose with minutes).</p>		
28	Clarification on when UDC can be an MSP. Both sets of Direct Access rules have different definitions. (ACC Rules and HB 2663) (PSWG – DASR)	01/26/00	Policy		see Issue 36 & 56	<p>Example, in APS territory they cannot be an MSP for any customer except under 20 kW and residential customer.</p> <p>Additionally, when are meter exchanges required within the service territories?</p> <p>02/01/00 In service territory's governed by ACC Competition Rules (R14-2-1615-B), on January 1, 2001 no affected utility can offer competitive services.</p> <p>What if there are no service providers offering these services at a</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>competitive rate after 01/01/01 that make it cost effective for customers to switch? This is a Commission and Legislative issue.</p> <p>(APSES-Barbara Klemstine) Will provide a proposal to group next week showing why the UDC can be an MSP.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> take Barbara's "white pages" to our companies to see if any problems/issues with the document. Be prepared to discuss next week. May need to create a waiver for this. <u>Action:</u> APS to determine implementation issues regarding issues #28, #36, & #56</p> <p>Barry Scott does not want a rule written that choice of MSP has to be chosen by ESP. It should be the customer's choice.</p> <p>There is still issue remaining which will be included on ACC report.</p>		
29	Are 997s required for all transactions? Is that going to be our recommendation for the Arizona standards? (PSWG – Remittance)	01/27/00	Policy	02/08/00		<p>EDI 997s are an industry standard transaction (EDI syntax validation)</p> <p>02/01/00 Yes, a 997 acknowledgement is required on all standardized EDI transaction sets. Policy group will recommend the level of acknowledgement should be determined by the individual trading partners.</p> <p>02/08/00 Is a 997 required for meter data that is extracted from a MRSP web site?</p>	3	Open
30	Do we need to prioritize transactions by importance due to financial considera-	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		<p>Example, SRP requires acknowledgement both incoming and outgoing within 24 hours.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	tions and customer service (for problem resolution and cycle time of EDI 824)?					All subcommittees need to define transaction cycle time.		
31	Is there a need to standardize dual path or single path when handling the 820? Do we provide a remittance advice directly to ESP and payment directly to bank (dual path)? OR do both documents go directly to bank (single path)?	01/27/00	Remittance	02/08/00		Payments go to bank and details go to provider. Since most banks are currently using VANS, sending both transactions may be costly to sending parties.		Open
32	What are true costs of CT/VT (PT) if an ESP wants to buy the equipment? Cost to replace equipment at today's market price OR cost to UDC and depreciated by years since installation. (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		see Issue 44 & 54	<p>Issues 32, 44, & 54 – (SRP - Renee Castillo) will have more information regarding these items for the 03/08/00 meeting.</p> <p>03/07/00 (ref: 32, 44 & 54) Suggestions: lease CT/PT/VT's or have a long- term purchase plan.</p> <p>APSES-Jim Wonter will contact California to see how they handle CT PT ownership issues.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> UDC's discuss w/ companies lease agreements, long term payment plans and their defense on why want to own them.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Clarify rule 14-2-1612-K10. <u>Action:</u> All market participants review rule 14-2-1612-K10. Determine if we want to interpret/re-word using UDC shall own, UDC shall not own, may own or may own at discretion of the customer. Be prepared to defend/come to a consensus.</p> <p>03/14/00 Costs range from roughly \$230-\$3500. <u>Action:</u> ESP's to</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>provide more detail regarding long-term payment plan (how much/how long).</p> <p>APS/TEP will not support a leasing option APS will support the payment plan option only if for the life of the contract between the ESP & customer.</p> <p>03/22/00 ESP's don't want to resort to a lease/payment plan option until issue of UDCs maintaining ownership of CT/PT's has been resolved.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) Per Position document issued by Tony Gilooly, they are still working on costs. (APS) Installed equipment, material and labor, depreciated by 5 years. (SRP) in process of developing IT equipment costs for full metering competition scheduled for 12/31/00. (Mohave and Navopche) Would support selling at Fair market cost to replace equipment. (Sulfer Srpings) Current Book Value minus depreciation.</p>		
33	For access to a meter, some UDCs require ESP to get keys, combos, etc. from customer. In many cases, the customer does not have a key.	01/27/00	Metering		06/22/00	<p>02/03/00 APS is not going to provide keys to MSP. They would like the MSP to get key from customer.</p> <p>MSP and MRSP issues: Customers may not have keys. Utility keys may not be able to be duplicated. Or utilities may want to offer a dual locking device on a contractual basis with utilities and MSPs.</p> <p>New West Energy – This is a barrier to getting access to change meters for customers to go DA.</p> <p>Suggestion - If customer is releasing their customer data (historical) anyhow, could key process be incorporated in release?</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><u>Action</u>: All Utilities need to research what their key policy is and report to subcommittee by 02/16/00. Janie Mollon will bring CA access process.</p> <p>(Schlumberger - Jamie) In case of customer's lock, they are cutting lock and supplying a new lock to customer. Customer responsible for getting a key to UDC for access to site. (Marv Buck – CUBR) suggesting UDCs change customer supplied locks with UDC supplied locks. Then UDC retains possession of master key and can supply slave keys to customer for them to get to MSP and ESP.</p> <p>Proposal: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. Customer's responsibility to get new key to UDC. MSP will communicate access changes back to UDC on the MIRN form in remarks section.</p> <p>(Citizens Utilities) UDC requires access to metering equip on customers premises for safety reasons and already have keys that were supplied to the customer. ESP should be responsible for supplying UDC with a key to any lock changed on the customer's metering form. It is not reasonable to require customer to produce another key for UDC.</p> <p>05/18/00 Phaser (Janet Henry) CA gives MSP keys to their locks and lockboxes. – A question was asked "who is responsible/liable during the time MSP cuts UDC lock and the time UDC gets back out there to replace their lock?" Solution: UDCs provide MSPs with padlocks to seal UDC side of locking device.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p><u>Action:</u> (due 06/21) UDCs determine if they can give a supply of UDC locks to MSPs operating in their territory.</p> <p>06/21/00 Proposal: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. MSP will place a dual hasp on customer's lock and then seal up the other hole on hasp. This will be indicated on MIRN form for UDC to replace the seal with UDC lock. If MSP cuts UDC lock, they will replace it with a dual hasp with a new customer lock and a seal where UDC lock will be placed. This will be noted on MIRN form and UDC will replace the seal in their normal course of business.</p> <p>06/22/00 Resolution: For customer supplied locks, MSP will cut the lock, if applicable, and supply customer with a new lock and keys. Customer's responsibility to get new key to UDC. MSP will communicate access changes back to UDC on the MIRN form in remarks section.</p>		
34	There is no formalized process to report meter exceptions between UDCs and ESPs. Examples: agreement metering programming, if MI/MAC forms are not completely filled out, etc. See MADEN for details on exception reasons. (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		see Issue 52	<p>(New West Energy - Janie) will provide information regarding this.</p> <p>Proposal: Consensus that a formal communication method (similar to MADEN) will be utilized. Details of what data elements/guidelines will be discussed in both the metering & billing subcommittees.</p>	3	Pend
35	At what point does an ESP take responsibility on a me-	01/27/00	Metering			02/03/00 <u>Action:</u> Utilities to report on their processes 02/16/00.		Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	ter exchange? And who is responsible for energy consumption during the exchange?					<p>06/21/00 Proposal: Point in time when ESP takes responsibility depends on switch procedures in the separate UDC territories.</p> <p>07/19/00 Discussion centered on calculation of usage, responsibilities of entities in calculation, and how it is reflected on the MORN form. Group consensus that if meter is out more than 15 minutes, usage will be calculated. Group agreed that except for scheduling and lost registrations, the process is complete. <u>Action</u>: (UDC) determine what they need to calculate usage and how they to incorporate into their procedures for Aug mtg.</p> <p>08/16/00 Discussion regarding who is the responsible party. No clear language in CC&N or Rules that indicate MSP is responsible for calculating Lost Registration. <u>Action Item</u>: APS, APSES and New West Energy research past meter exchanges to determine how long meters are typically out of the socket. Some participants believe amount of unaccounted for energy is so insignificant it may not warrant the calculation. <u>Action Item</u> (due Sept mtg): All participants present their proposed load limit that lost registration would need to be calculated.</p>		
36	ACC Rules Question: Can UDC provide metering and installation services for DA customer? Short term and after January 1, 2001? (PSWG –Metering)	01/27/00	Policy		see Issue 28 & 56	<u>Action</u> : Participants need to read the ACC and HB2663 and be prepared to discuss issue.	1	Open
37	Load research meters- Are UDCs intending have a dual meter installed or are they going to pick another sam-	01/27/00	Metering	05/18/00		<p>02/03/00 <u>Action</u> (due 01/26/00): Utilities to document and report what the process will be for handling Load Research meter.</p> <p>02/16/00 (SRP) will choose new sample. In most cases, phone</p>	1	Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	ple customer when the customer goes DA? Will UDCs allow ESPs to use existing phone line to read meter for DA purposes? Or vice versa - can UDC use ESP phone lines?					line owned by the customer. (APS) will choose new sample. In a few cases, they will remove their existing phone line. 04/27/00 Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison to be included with PSWG report to the Commission.		
38	Will UDCs allow ESPs to interrogate meters on non-DA customers for load research purposes/ billing option purposes? (PSWG – Metering)	01/27/00	Policy			(New West Energy - Janie) will clarify at 03/13/00 meeting. Details on Issue: Customer is not DA and wants load research data for informational purposes. Example: ESP may be taking multiple customer accounts but not all of them. ESP would like a secondary password to review this information so they can provide information of all sites (even those not going DA) to customer. If there is no IDR meter at site, customer would need to initiate an IDR meter from UDC and pay associated costs.	3	Open
39	Do DA meters installed have to have a visual display? This limits equipment types that can be installed.	01/27/00	Metering			02/03/00 TR Recorder does not have a display. Requirement came from a EUSERC. <u>Action</u> : Utilities need to report on their needs for display by 02/16/00. (APS – Jeanine) will check the EUSERC requirements. ESPs will report on what impacts this requirement could have in their organizations. According to ANSI, a display is not 'required'. Further discussion needed. Metering boxes are the way technology is moving, therefore no display. This may be a customer issue. Utilities to report on why a display is needed. Darrel Pichoff to check with RUCO to see if there's a requirement.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>03/02/00 (Prem Bahl – RUCO) RUCO's position is there must be a visual display on all electric meters for residential consumers. Consumer must be able to read the kWh and kW readings. RUCO will insist on this. (K.R. Saline) represents 24 Irrigation Districts, Electrical Districts, and Municipalities. KRS will insist on visual displays on electric meters for both residential and commercial customers.</p> <p>04/27/00 To be addressed in an upcoming meeting since this issue is currently happening in production today.</p>		
40	What are UDC processes for scheduling MSP work? What if an MSP picks a date to remove and install a meter and schedule must be changed? How are these exceptions handled?	01/27/00	Metering		04/27/00	<p>02/3/00 May be addressed when we start to review the data elements. Utilities must be able to speak to schedules on metering.</p> <p>04/27/00 MDCR and procedures address this issue. Refer to UDC Business Rule Comparison document.</p> <p><u>RESOLUTION:</u> (Agreed upon business rule): Initial MDCR Form and EPA (if applicable) must be returned at least five (5) work-days prior to the exchange. These documents will be in Excel and sent via email. Notification of changes to the schedule, including rescheduling and unscheduling, must be sent to UDC by 2:00pm (Arizona time) one (1) workday prior to scheduled work date. UDC will communicate any exceptions to MSP within two (2) workdays of the receipt.</p>	1	Resv
41	Who is responsible for validating that a meter can be read after a MSP has set a new meter?	01/27/00	Metering			<p>In CA, it's a requirement from CPUC (Rule 22), the ESP is responsible for ensuring newly installed meter can be read prior to 1st billing by MRSP or face penalties.</p> <p>02/03/00 (First Point) This is usually done at the meter install</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						time. 04/27/00 To be addressed in the VEE sub/subgroup.		
42	Will we require an 824 on all transactions (accepted or take exception to a data element). Do we only want to get an 824 when there's a problem with data? (PSWG - Policy)	02/01/00	Remittance					Open
43	Is there a regulatory requirement for UDCs to collect and remit charitable contributions to social agencies. And is there any regulatory requirement for ESP's to participate in collecting or remitting charitable contributions on behalf of UDC. ESP	02/02/00	Billing		see Issue 16	There is potential for state funds to be reduced because there potentially is no requirement to continue these programs.	3	Open
44	Clarify ownership of CT and VTs (PT) based on voltage level. (PSWG – Metering)	02/03/00	Policy		see issue 32 & 54	02/03/00 Will refer to ACC Rules 05/09/00 Clarification of ownership completed - Refer to Business Rule Comparison document from Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee group. 09/01/00– Refer to Business Rule Comparison document from Metering Systems and Meter Reading Subcommittee group.	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
45	Standardized data content, data format and data transmission needed for Metering Data.	02/03/00	Metering		04/27/00	<p>Fax and email are not acceptable forms of data transmission. Trading Partners are not able to populate their databases.</p> <p>04/27/00 Subgroup has standardized the data content, data format and a basic transmission method (email with Excel spreadsheet). Additional electronic methods will be explored.</p>		Resv
46	All Arizona EDI (DASRs, 867, 810, 650) should utilize GMT for business transactions and local time for the enveloping. To avoid problems and unnecessary costs to conform to national standardization in the future, standard time references should be implemented immediately by each UDC and EDI mapping can be phased in. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		04/25/00	<p>This change would help market participants, particularly MDMA/MRSPs, to save costs by not having to adapt their systems to Arizona's unique requirements.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants need to see what the use of GMT will do to their systems.</p> <p>02/16/00 Proposal: All participants will use GMT format for all transactions that require a time stamp. <u>Action:</u> Find out how long the conversion to the GMT format will take. Consensus was reached.</p> <p><u>Proposal:</u> All Arizona EDI transaction set data content will utilize GMT time and GMT time code. The enveloping of EDI transactions will utilize the sender's local time.</p> <p>Implementation Issue: This recommendation refers to the ACC rule that states data transmission will be sent in Arizona time. Policy Group will recommend a change to the ACC Rules.</p> <p>03/28/00 Determined this is not a rule change, it is actually noted in the CC&N's.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Paul will talk with ACC to determine what needs to take</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>place to get issue resolved. Can staff just send a notice to existing certified entities advising them of the change to GMT?</p> <p>04/25/00 Need to review new proposition. Be prepared to make your company's final decision.</p> <p>GMT was adopted. The original proposal above was adopted. A letter to the Utility Director will be sent by the PSWG.</p>		
47	Standardization of Billing Options (ESP and UDC consolidated billing as well as Dual billing) from all UDCs should be implemented immediately to provide customer choice. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy			<p>A working group of market participants should study the intent of Commission Rules and make a determination that applies to all UDCs. Terms and Conditions for credit, payments and partial payments, and other billing processes should be standardized for all UDCs. During the direct access rulemaking process, an earlier working group discussed whether billing options should be discretionary, but no consistent position was reached. Market participants need to clarify the procedures for consistency among UDCs.</p> <p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the limitations on customer choice caused by differences in billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion and criticism will be reduced, and ESPs will have flexibility to meet individual customer needs.</p>	2	Open
48	For all Billing and Metering data, UDCs should employ same rule and/or formula for rounding up data and rounding in calculations. Business process should be implemented immediately by	01/25/00	Policy		02/29/00	<p>In order to develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by differences in data and billing procedures among UDCs will be removed. Customer confusion will be reduced.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants need to investigate what their rounding processes are on meter reading and billing. They also need to</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	each UDC. Include related changes or impacts to other processes or procedures. (APSES)					<p>investigate how their CIS/MDMA systems handle rounding.</p> <p>02/16/00 Jim will provide more examples to help define the issue.</p> <p>02/22/00 Jim brought examples of rounding issues and found issues were not widespread and magnitude is fairly small. These issues will be discussed with individual UDCs. Pending resolution at 02/29/00 meeting.</p> <p>02/29/00 No standardization needed.</p>		
49	<p>Develop interim business processes that can be implemented manually, and plan mapping for both out-bound (UDC to ESP) and in-bound (ESP to UDC) DASRs for the following communications. Business processes should be implemented immediately by each UDC with as much consistency as possible, and EDI mapping can be phased in.</p> <p>Customer Moving: - Notification of direct access customer moving to new address within the same distribution company territory without having to return to</p>	01/25/00	DASR			<p>Customers need the flexibility to contact either their ESP or UDC to implement a request, as provided by proposed business processes. The customer's choice and other information can be communicated by e-mail or fax until out-bound/ in-bound DASRs are functional. Customers will not be burdened with having to make numerous phone calls to UDCs and ESPs to implement their service choice. To develop a viable direct access market, the burdens and costs caused by unnecessary switches to/from bundled service will be removed. "Customer choice" will become more of a reality.</p>		Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	bundled service. (APSES)							
50	New Customer - Same Facility: - A new customer takes over an existing direct access facility, keeps same ESP and meter without returning to bundled service. (APSES)	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
51	Account Update - Notification of changed account information. UC and PD DASRs appear to be both in/out-bound in the Arizona DASR Handbook (APSES)	01/25/00	DASR			see Issue 49, Description, paragraph 1		Open
52	UDCs and market participants need a clearly-defined communication process for promptly communicating and resolving problems with data, meters, or bills among ESPs, MSPs, MRSPs, and UDCs (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		see Issue 34	<p>Process should be initiated by any participant to establish communication to solve problem within a defined time frame, if possible, and, if necessary, to maintain communication until root cause analysis is complete. Standardized process should be implemented immediately by each participant and automated by all parties as soon as possible.</p> <p>An example of the California "MADEN" process is attached to the original change control document.</p> <p>Process will reduce meter and data errors that cause billing errors and delays in billing and receiving revenue. It will help provide customer satisfaction by reducing billing questions and complaints to both UDCs and ESPs.</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
53	Blackout period for Direct Access meter exchanges is too long and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)	01/25/00	Metering			<p>Currently, the three largest UDCs require meters needing to be changed for Direct Access service cannot be changed for a period of time around the current meter's read date. The length of time varies by UDC, but extends up to approximately nine (9) working days for one UDC. This requirement is problematic for ESPs and MSPs because it allows meters to be exchanged during only half of the month for each account (9 working days equates to approximately half of a calendar month). When a customer has multiple accounts on multiple read cycles that all require meter exchanges, MSP must plan their installation schedule around UDC blackout period. This makes it virtually impossible to exchange multiple meters on consecutive days during the month. Since most certified MSPs are installing meters with out-of-state personnel, this requirement adds to the cost of meter exchanges for MSPs and ultimately for ESPs and customers.</p> <p>Proposal: Metering subcommittee should examine process for meter exchanges and shorten or eliminate blackout period requirement. Subcommittee should look at best practices in other states where blackout periods have been eliminated or greatly reduced to foster a more efficient competitive market. Where possible, blackout periods should be consistent across UDCs in the state.</p> <p>Suggestion: (New West Energy - Janie Mollon) To switch customer, MSP could not install a meter five (5) workdays before a read date or two (2) workdays after a read date. The actual switch happens on the read date.</p> <p>03/16/00 (APSES - Jim Wontor) brought another proposal. Eliminate blackout periods and allow customer's to switch on</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>exchange date.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> ESPs will consolidate their proposals for a best practice suggestion on 03/30/00.</p> <p>04/27/00 Refer to ESP Hybrid proposal addressing switch dates and blackout windows. Also, see UDC Response to Provider Hybrid Proposal.</p> <p>Consensus was not reached between TEP, SRP and APS. APS operates currently without a blackout window even though their Schedule 10 allows for a blackout window. SRP does not operate without a blackout window. TEP operates with a 5 workday blackout window.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> APS need to find out how long they are willing to work without for 6 mos. a blackout window. TEP will check with their staff to see if they will work with the 5 workday blackout window and then reevaluate in 6 mos.</p> <p>(Navopache - Dennis Hughes) would agree to work with the 5 workday blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts after 6 months. (Trico – Anne Cobb) They certainly see advantages to having a blackout period. They would agree to work with the blackout window with the agreement to reevaluate any market impacts after 6 months.</p>		
54	Ownership of Current Transformers (CTs) and Voltage Transformers (VTs formerly known as PTs) is not consistent across UDCs.	01/25/00	Metering	09/18/00	see Issue 32 & 44	ACC rules for Direct Access and the Electric Competition Act provide for UDC to own and maintain both CTs and VTs. However, interpretation of these rules differs by UDC. One UDC mandates that CT/VTs be purchased by Customer or ESP/MSP if they are below a certain voltage size. Another UDC maintains	1	Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	(APSES)					<p>ownership and maintenance responsibilities of CT/VTs for all customers. And the third major UDC maintains ownership of CT/VTs, but requires ESP/MSP to maintain them. This inconsistency creates difficulty for an ESP, especially when dealing with customers with facilities in more than one service territory. Requiring ESP/MSP or customer to purchase the equipment also adds a potentially significant cost and may be a barrier for many customers who otherwise might seek alternative suppliers. In California, CT/VTs are treated as part of the UDC distribution system and ownership/maintenance responsibilities are retained by UDC.</p> <p>Proposal: Metering Working Group should look at intent of the language in competition rules regarding equipment ownership and make a determination on CT/VT ownership that all UDCs can implement on a consistent basis.</p> <p>03/14/00 <u>Action</u>: APS/TEP will investigate whether they can agree to own CT/VT's above the secondary voltage level (600 volts or less). This will not require a rule change...it will require a tariff change. <u>Action</u>: APS will determine amount of primary customer accounts.</p> <p>Issue: Can customer own their own CT/PT's? Need clarification of the rules.</p> <p>05/09/00 (APS) changing their position regarding ownership of CT/PTs. Position statement is: "APS is agreeable to retaining ownership of CT/sPT's for Direct Access locations providing tariff and operational issues impacted by this change are effectively and equitably resolved. (TEP, Sulfur Springs, Navopache and Mohave) prefer Rules to stay as is regarding CT/PT owner-</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>ship, however, they are willing to review suggested rule change. (APSES) Recommend rule language change to add "...at discretion of customer" to the end of the first sentence of section R14-2-1612.k section 10.</p> <p><u>Action Items:</u> Jim Wontor (APSES) will send out proposed language to PSWG participants by 05/10/00. Participants be prepared with their company position on the proposed language to the 05/23/00 meeting.</p> <p>07/19/00 (APS) handouts re: ownership and pulse overflow discussed. Several Coops support APS new position that UDC own and maintain all CT/PTs. Draft Equipment Authorization Form reviewed. Bulk form may not be necessary with APS change on CT/VT ownership. (APSES) proposed revised language in form.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> (APS) to revise EPS form and send out for (All members) review prior to next meeting discussion. (TEP) to report plans for ownership where an existing CT/PT goes bad and the ESP/MSP replaces it.</p> <p>08/16/00 – (TEP) reported they will provide a replacement CT/VT if existing CT/VT is damaged at no charge to competitive provider. Currently, TEP does not provide CT/VT for new installations. TEP will refile their tariff to separate the CT/VT charge from the other metering charges. Upon approval, TEP will provide CT/VT for new installations. *see TEP handout for additional revised CT/VT information.</p>		
55	UDC fees for Direct Access services (CISR, DASR, metering, meter reading, billing,	01/25/00	Policy			The 3 largest UDCs have proposed varying fees for Direct Access services, such as: meter information, submitting Direct Access Service Requests, meter installations or removals, meter	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	settlement, etc.) are too high and not consistent between UDCs. (APSES)					<p>reading services, consolidated and/or dual billing, and settlement billing. These fees are, in some cases, excessively high and do not reflect the true marginal cost of providing these services. Many fees are required by one UDC, but not at all by other UDCs. Even when required by all UDCs for same service, fees are not consistent and vary quite substantially. All the various fees provide an additional barrier to development of a competitive market in Arizona.</p> <p>Proposal To develop a viable market in Arizona, a group consisting of market participants should be tasked with determining which fees should be mandatory, which fees should be discretionary, and which fees should be deferred until the market has developed. This group should also recommend which costs could be recovered as part of base rates and which should be recovered in service fees. Finally, the group should recommend a consistent, cost-based methodology for calculating the costs to be recovered by the UDCs.</p>		
56	Non-availability of local alternatives for providing competitively priced metering services. (APSES)	01/25/00	Policy		see Issue 28 & 36	Currently, there are very few Meter Service Providers (MSPs) or Meter Reading Service Providers (MRSPs) that have facilities and personnel in Arizona. Most of the certificated providers are based out-of-state and cannot, by ACC rules, subcontract with non-certificated personnel in the state. This potentially drives up the cost of some services that require personnel to travel to Arizona. Additionally, since UDCs cannot provide competitive metering services beyond the year 2000, most have chosen not to provide a full menu of services during the year 2000. Both of these factors produce situations where the cost of providing competitive metering services are higher than they would be if they were provided by personnel already located in the state.	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>Policy Working Group should recommend that, to stimulate market and cost effective provision of competitive services, the following changes should be made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) UDCs should be allowed to provide competitive metering services at a competitive market price, and 2) 2) MSP/MRSPs should be allowed to subcontract for services to qualified personnel, without having to make them employees of the company, as long as the certificated MSP/MRSP is still responsible for the work they perform. <p>03/14/00 Barb Klemstine will change the wording on the MSP qualifications/ requirements that is attached to the CC&N in regards to item 3. She will include wording so that the MSP & their agents will be held to the same rules.</p> <p>White Paper Results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. TEP & APS agree – waiver will be needed 2. TEP & APS don't agree due to procurement & labor issues 3. TEP & APS agree with some clarification of the rules. <p><u>Action:</u> TEP & APS will begin working on a waiver for white paper issue #1 (non-residential load profile)</p> <p>04/11/00 Be prepared to discuss item #2 (subcontracting) at next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 Bob Grey will check with DebScott to verify status of this issue.</p>		
57	How will we handle customer bill disputes that are filed with the ACC for ESP	02/08/00	Billing			(ACC -Bill Rigsby) will check at ACC how often customers file complaints with ACC for bill disputes. How will UDCs handle requirement for the ESP to make us whole?	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	Consolidated Billing. ESP					<p><u>Action:</u> (ACC -Bill Rigsby) to check at ACC for proposed changes</p> <p>04/06/00 (ACC -Bill Rigsby) - Believes the ACC will be notifying both ESP and UDC regarding any consumer disputes.</p> <p>Resolution: Billing subcommittee will make a formal recommendation within the report to have ACC notify both ESP and UDC of any formal dispute.</p>		
58	How will bill inserts be handled for ESP Consolidated billing as it relates to mandated regulatory messages? ESP	02/08/00	Billing			<p>ESPs will not print marketing messages on their bill. In CA, UDCs have to submit their inserts to CPUC for review. If there is marketing language in the inserts, UDCs have to remove the language. ESPs also have an opportunity to review all messages prior to distribution to the customer.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Be prepared to discuss this issue. UDC's determine process for removing marketing language from mandatory messages.</p> <p>04/06/00 (TEP) will strip their marketing messages from the mandated bill messages. (APS) will not be send bill messages electronically</p> <p>05/24/00 (New West Energy) wants it sent electronically, then they will print message/stuffer with the bill. (TEP) agreed to send insert electronically (email with document attached) and/or post it to their website. (APS) will verify if they can accommodate this proposal.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> APS to verify if they can create WORD document, not PDF, so ESP can transfer data to the bill.</p>	2	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						06/22/00 Agreement needs to be made between ESP and UDC re: how marketing messages will be delivered (web site, e-mail etc.)		
59	Need clarification on estimating rules, specifically section 210-A3-5	02/08/00	Billing			Confusion about load profiled customer or customers needing load data. Does this have anything to do with real time pricing?	3	Open
60	According to the Rules, a third party can be back billed up to 12 months. What will the process be for back-billing third parties? (R14-21-E3)	02/08/00	Billing			According to the rules, there are specifics on how utilities bill a 3 rd party but there is no specification for any other market participants. (R14-2-210-E3)	2	Open
61	Who is responsible for tracking the performance of MSP and MRSP's? What is process for communicating this information? (PSWG – Billing)	02/08/00	Metering		see Issue 65	06/22/00 Discussion also focused on possible timelines and CUBR has performance standards. Reassigned from Policy to Metering. 0720/00 Issue should refer only to MSPs. (TEP) Position on MSP Performance Standards was provided.	3	Open
62	If back billing is required for period where the customer is both Standard Offer and DA, for ESP Consolidated Billing, the ESPs will want to bill/pay only the DA period	02/08/00	Billing		see Issue 7	03/22/00 (New West Energy -Janie) to bring California options to next meeting. <u>Action:</u> UDC's to see how can supply intermittent data. 04/06/00 ESP's Proposal: Current bill agent will bill for current charges. Original bill agent will be responsible to bill the re-bill period for which they had relationship with the consumer. Dual Billing will be used as a back-up default when an original ESP is	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						no longer in business or by mutual agreement by all parties involved.		
63	If UDC or ESP charges are not transmitted by the drop dead date/time, what is the responsibility of biller to include language on the bill advising customer of missing charges.	02/08/00	Billing				3	Open
64	<p>How many decimal places should be required before applying the multiplier to a demand read?</p> <p>How many decimal places should be required for billing demand? (PSWG – Policy)</p> <p>In 867, when we convert the kW back to a read how many decimal places need to be accommodated?</p> <p>Do we want MRSP to give us usage/multiplier or give us actual read (w/ two decimal places)?</p>	02/16/00	Metering		04/13/00	<p><u>Action</u>: Can CIS multipliers be changed to “one” since the MRSP is adding in the multiplier to the demand provided in 867.</p> <p>Review 867 guideline to determine if the billing demand posted should have multiplier applied to it. MSP required to apply multiplier to the demand.</p> <p><u>Action</u>: Utilities need to research when a demand figure is received from an MRSP, what is their process for backing out the multiplier and extracting the read. Considerations: Decimal points accommodated and having different multipliers for demand meters in CIS systems.</p> <p><u>Action</u>: Check 867 requirements to ensure we are all on the same page. Check for all issues pertaining to the 867 (issue #64, #46, & #65)</p> <p>03/16/00 What is happening on the MRSP reads? Reads are coming with inconsistent data. Example, some with 1 decimal place, others with up to 4 decimal places. UDCs take demand reads up to 2 decimal places. Any more than 2 decimal places</p>	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>are either truncated or rounded by UDCs in order to bill. This could cause demand calculation to be off from what the other party would be billing.</p> <p>Possible Solution: MRSP can deliver the read rounding to 2 decimal places. Or demand be figured on interval data only.</p> <p>Both ESP and UDC would have to bill off the same value (kW figured on read or interval data) to ensure same billing kW figure.</p> <p>Currently ESPs are not billing on demand. This will become an issue when they decide to start billing the demand. If they were to bill off the demand, they would extract it from the interval data. Although the read would still need to be supplied for VEE.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> Participants need to go back to their companies to see if they can handle kW reads to 2 decimal places. Are the parties willing to say that this would be the standard.</p> <p>(Citizens Utilities) Their system is not set up to bill multipliers already applied. This will cause manual work on our billing staff and potentially result in billing errors.</p> <p>04/13/00 Consensus of Metering subcommittee – two (2) decimal places.</p>		
65	Arizona 867requires MRSPs or UDCs to pass billing reads. Is this necessary? Could Interval data only be passed? Then UDC/ESP would be responsible for	02/17/00	Metering	08/15/00	06/22/00	<p>Confirm it is a requirement to have both begin and end reads. Yes, this is a requirement.</p> <p>03/16/00 (APS -Joe Webster) They need both the interval and billing reads. This is used for the VEE process. They would need reads off the register (encoded), not calculated reads. (SRP</p>		Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	creating billing reads. Determine if read will be encoded or calculated.					<p>-Greg Carrel) on interval data accounts, they bill off interval data only. Interval data is VEEd on the interval data. (Navapache - Dennis Hughes) They have apx 7,000 interval data accounts. However, they bill off billing reads. (TEP) On very select occasions, they will bill off IDR data. However, they validate on billing reads.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> A small subcommittee will review possible solutions to this issue: Marv Buck, Janie Mollon, Tim Jones, Kimane Aycocock, Joe Webster, Darrell Shear, Greg Carrel, and reps from TEP. They will report back to Metering Subcommittee on 04/13/00.</p> <p>04/27/00 Refer to UDC/ESP Proposal. (Citizens Utilities) sent comments their company does not support this proposal. Dennis Hughes reported that (AEPCO) does not support this proposal. Subgroup took a vote to bring issue to full PSWG meeting and only 2/3 majority was reached. Further discussion needed. Renee Castillo and Marv Buck will develop memo to be sent out to full PSWG. Will set aside 1 hour of discussion to take place immediately after PSWG meeting on 05/03/00. All market participants are encouraged to attend the discussion.</p> <p>05/31/00 Proposal: Barry Scott presented unified Coop proposal for distribution metering. Citizens agreed with the counter proposal. Coops and Citizens prefer registered reads, but would take calculated reads if ACC staff would agree that calculated reads are treated as registered reads. Implemented for one (1) year from first DA customer in each respective territory, and issue of taking raw interval data reads then being revisited.</p> <p>06/22/00 RESOLUTION: Commission Staff agreed to 05/31/00 proposal.</p>		

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>07/19/00 (APS) provided handout of implementation issues/ process at subcommittee meeting. <u>Action:</u> (APS) to report on its implementation date.</p> <p>07/20/00 Missing intervals and zero intervals referred to next VEE session.</p>		
66	<p>How are UDCs identifying master meter and showing subsequent sub-meters?</p> <p>Is there a common way to identify meters with same address with multiple meters? Currently UDC issues one MI form per meter.</p>	02/17/00	Metering		04/27/00	<p><u>Action:</u> Identify how UDCs are handing totalized metering and sites with multiple meters.</p> <p>04/27/00 Number of meters is Identified on the new EMI forms.</p>	3	Resv
67	<p>#1 If a master metered account goes DA, does ESP lose grandfathered agreements to continue with master metering?</p> <p>#2 If a master metered account is DA and an individual customer within the master metered property wants to return to Bundles Service, will the UDCs allow that individual customer to come back or vice versa</p>	02/17/00	Metering	09/18/00		<p>Action: for UDCs to research. Dave Rumolo will research FERC requirements.</p> <p>04/27/00 Dennis Hughes to follow up with Dave to verify status is of this issue.</p> <p>07/19/99 Most members agreed master metered accounts have right to go DA. (Phaser) noted this is not a problem in California. <u>Action:</u> (TEP) will review its position and comment at Aug meeting.</p> <p>08/16/00 (TEP) Q1 -TEP will allow a master metered account to return to Bundled Service from DA as long as the property meets requirements and tariff is active. (See TEP position papers from</p>	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						8/16/00 meeting) Q2 - TEP will allow individual customer to stay Standard Offer while master metered account goes DA (or vice versa). In this case, metering point must be upgraded to meet all of TEP regulations and service requirements to handle it as a single dwelling. This will require new underground or overheard service lines and an approved pedestal or meter socket at the customer's expense. (APS) Q1- No, customer does not lose master metering when returning to Standard Offer. Q2 - APS to report back with information at Sep meeting. (Navopache) Q1 - No, customer does not lose master metering when returning to Standard Offer. Q2 - Navopache to report back with information at Sep meeting. (Sulfur Springs Electric Cooperative) Q1 - Sulfur Springs to report back with information at Sep meeting. Q2 - Sulfur Springs to report back with information at Sep meeting. (Trico) Q1 Trico to report back with information at Sep meeting. Q2 - Trico to report back with information at Sep meeting		
68	Site Meets – What are UDC policies?	02/17/00	Metering			Add to Business Rule Document. 04/27/00 UDC policies and procedures have been added to the Business Rule Comparison Document.	1	Resv
69	What is the enforceability of recommended processes or rules of non-ACC jurisdictional entities? (PSWG – Metering)	02/17/00	Policy			Where does an ESP file noncompliance complaints for those entities that are not governed by the ACC rulings?	3	Open
70	A utility can back-bill a third party (if party at fault) up to 12 months (R14-212-/e3). This	02/22/00	Policy			Should this Rule be modified to allow all parties providing meter data to be back-billed by recipients of the incorrect data?	3	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	is only specific to the utility. Should Rule be applicable to other participants and not just the utility?							
71	If after receiving an RQ DASR and UDC is planning to disconnect for non-payment or turn off a customer prior to switch, what is process to notify ESP that customer will be disconnected. (PSWG – Billing)	02/24/00	Metering			<p>This particular issue focuses more on how the metering side is handled when this type of issue arises. How to stop the meter exchange process.</p> <p>04/27/00 Will be reviewed when additional business processes are reviewed.</p>	3	Open
72	How are adjustments going to be handled in the 810.	02/24/00	Billing		see Issue 7	<p>How will we communicate reason for Misc. adjustments.</p> <p>04/06/00 UDC's to come up with list of various adjustments made on a bill and be prepared to discuss at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/24/00 Revisions compiled for implementation guides of BEN and Rebate/ Rebill notification processes.</p>	1	Open
73	<p>Is NERC using Standard Central Time in Non-EDI transactions?</p> <p>Why is NERC using Standard Central Time and should we be using it?</p>	02/29/00	Policy			<p>03/07/00 Address once NERC has made their decision on which standard time to use. Suggestion: Send a letter to NERC recommending GMT. <u>Action:</u> Talk w/ your companies re: support of the GMT format (issue #46) as a standard so can file for a joint waiver. E-mail to Evelyn by 03/13/00. Evelyn will write the waiver to present to the ACC.</p> <p>Yes, NERC is using Central Standard Time.</p> <p>03/28/00 <u>Action:</u> Shirley & Jim will flow out process' for converting</p>	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						data to Standard Time Zones. 06/22/00 Priority set at 1.		
74	Navapache will be submitting a report to PSWG regarding what their business processes will be for DA. (PSWG – Metering)	03/02/00	Policy			How should this report be represented in the 06/15/00 ACC report? This opportunity may need to be offered to all cooperatives. 04/25/00 Dan Laos - this issue became a cooperative response. Executive summary has been submitted to the Policy Subcommittee.	1	Pend
75	On incoming DASR – only kWh meter number is required. State DASR handbook does not accommodate a kWh meter and Kvar meters, or other metering combinations. (PSWG – metering)	03/16/00	DASR					Open
76	On DASR – forecasted meter owner is a required field. Is this appropriate? Should this be taken off of the RQ DASR? (PSWG -Metering)	03/16/00	DASR			In step 3 of Metering Business processes, the pending meter owner is also required. Meter owner may change from the time the DASR is submitted to the time the meter is exchanged.		Open
77	UMI was presumed to be national standard for identifying a single meter. It's not being used by any other state in dereg market. Most EDI documents are not imple-	03/16/00	Policy		03/28/00	Representatives from New West Energy, APSES, 1 st Point and Schlumberger are not using this number. It was suggested that this number not be implemented as an Arizona standard. 03/28/00 APSES does not need the UMI. Jim Wontor advises the UMI is not being used by MSP's (First Point & Schlumberger) in	1	Resv

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
	menting a UMI number. (PSWG – Metering)					<p>CA.</p> <p>This is not an industry standard that we thought it would be. No compelling reason for market participants to use the UMI standard.</p> <p>Proposal: Request Utilities Director remove requirement of using UMI standard from 05/01/99 report.</p>		
78	There is no language in Rules preventing MSP from contracting directly with customers, how should this issue be addressed?	03/28/00	Policy	08/07/00		<p>System implications – Will MSP have to submit DASR's?</p> <p>Rule change suggestion: Change the definition in Section R14-2-1601 "DASR means a form that contains all necessary billing and metering information to allow customers to switch electric service providers. This form must be submitted to the Utility Distribution Company <i>by the customer's Electric Service Provider load serving entity.</i>"</p> <p>This may force UDCs to create contracts for MSPs. ESP would send DASR but they would not be liable for MSP. Contract would allow UDC to hold MSP liable.</p> <p><u>Action:</u> All participants to assess impacts of MSP contracting directly with customer. Be prepared to discuss your company's position and provide solutions to this issue at the next meeting.</p> <p>05/09/00 (TEP) agrees there is no language in rules that precludes customer contracting directly with MSP. TEP would like to see language added to rules that would not allow a customer to contract directly with an MSP. (APS) identified contractual and system impacts if customer contracts directly with MSP. Systems and processes were developed to transmit DASR directly with</p>	1	Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
						<p>ESP only. (APSES) leans towards customer not subcontracting directly with MSP. MSPs should work through ESP so customer doesn't end up with a metering system ESP or MRSP cannot read.</p> <p>06/22/00 To be reviewed by ACC staff. Is this within the purview of PSWG? <u>Action</u>: (due 06/30) Participants to submit position papers per 06/22/00 minutes.</p> <p>07/04/00 (Marv Buck) provided an overview of how other states are handling. Participants (NWE, APS, TEP, Phaser, SRP, APSES) presented their positions in a consolidated document to the PSWG.</p> <p>07/20/00 Steve Olea presented ACC staff position: Electric Competition rules allow MSPs to contract directly with customers; operating procedures need to be developed. Issue will include only MSPs at this time, but MRSPs will be kept on radar screen. <u>Action</u>: Participants may submit issue sheets, including 1) impact of issue on business processes and 2) any past practices in markets that provide insight to edryer@tucsonelectric.com by 08/07/00.</p>		
79	Explore additional electronic methods for transmitting metering data.	04/27/00	Metering			06/22/00 Reassigned from Policy to Metering.		Open
80	What are the security and encryption standards that will be used in transmitting data (Barry Scott).	05/09/00	Policy			06/22/00 Priority set at 1.	1	Open

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
81	What information is provided on a CISR from each UDC and is that information consistent (Jim Wonter –APSES)	05/09/00	DASR			06/22/00 Priority set at 3.	3	Open
82	How are non-metered services going to be handled? What are the charges going to be? Who is responsible to maintain/bill for the services?	05/24/00	Billing			06/22/00 Assigned to Billing. <u>Action</u> : Each entity be prepared to discuss issue in July subcommittee meeting. 07/20/00 Participants concluded a separate bill for dusk-to-dawn lights or security systems does not make sense for a non-metered account customer. Members recognized 810 standard will not address non-metered accounts or non-energy related charges unless UDC and ESP agree to include such charges on an ESP consolidated bill.		Open
83	When customer switches from DA back to SO or ESP to ESP and the MRSP has not provided meter read data (or estimated reads) for previous months, what should the UDC/ESP do to retrieve missing data? How can the final bill get trued-up? Should the UDC/ESP be allowed to estimate the final bill?	06/22/00	Metering		see Issue 65	06/22/00 <u>Action</u> : Each entity to provide their solutions on how to handle this issue in July subcommittee meeting. 07/20/00 (APS) discussed MRSP Performance Standards at the PSWG mtg. (TEP) Position on MRSP Performance Standards was provided. 08/16/00 Billing Subgroup is currently addressing.	1	Open
84	Is the bill that is issued when a customer switches considered a "final" bill?	07/19/00	Billing					Pend

#	Issue	Date Identified	Sub-Committee	Date Needed	Date Resolved	Discussion	Priority	Status
85	Granfathering totalization of meters.	07/20/00	Policy			issue statement unclear		Pend
86	Standardization of application of long-term contracts on Standard Offer Tariffs	07/20/00	Policy			issue statement unclear		Pend